

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED

California Rules of Court, rule 8.1115(a), prohibits courts and parties from citing or relying on opinions not certified for publication or ordered published, except as specified by rule 8.1115(b). This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 8.1115.

IN THE COURT OF APPEAL OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

THIRD APPELLATE DISTRICT

(Butte)

CHARRISSA NICOLE HURST,

Plaintiff and Respondent,

v.

DANNY JAMES MITCHELL,

Defendant and Appellant.

C087708

(Super. Ct. No. 18FL00585)

Danny James Mitchell appeals from an order granting Charrissa Nicole Hurst a three-year restraining order. We will affirm.

BACKGROUND

Hurst sought a restraining order against Mitchell. Mitchell filed two responses to the request, writing that Hurst's allegations were false and unsupported. Mitchell's first response included many attachments.

A trial was held, and Hurst and her mother testified.¹ The trial court thereafter granted Hurst a three-year restraining order for her and her children. Mitchell appealed.

DISCUSSION

On appeal, Mitchell has filed a brief that is difficult to follow. He appears to raise numerous contentions, none of which are presented under separate heading, nor supported by authority. (See Cal. Rules of Court, rule 8.204 [briefs must “[s]tate each point under a separate heading or subheading summarizing the point, and support each point by argument and, if possible, by citation of authority”].) The contentions are therefore forfeited as improperly presented. (See *Consolidated Irrigation Dist. v. City of Selma* (2012) 204 Cal.App.4th 187, 201 [failure to comply with rule requiring each argument be presented under a separate heading forfeits the arguments]; *County of Butte v. Emergency Medical Services Authority* (2010) 187 Cal.App.4th 1175, 1196, fn. 7 [contention not supported by citation to legal authority is forfeited as improperly presented]; see also *Nwosu v. Uba* (2004) 122 Cal.App.4th 1229, 1247 [pro. per. litigants are treated like any other party and receive no greater consideration].)

And were the contentions not forfeited, they would lack merit. Of the arguments we can discern, Mitchell appears to contend that (1) several attachments to his response to the restraining order request were not file stamped; (2) the trial court abused its discretion in denying a continuance before trial; (3) several text messages were inadmissible hearsay and erroneously admitted; (4) the three-year restraining order was excessive and denied Mitchell his parental rights; and (5) the trial court judge had been

¹ On the eve of trial, Mitchell moved for a continuance, apparently in order to participate in mediation, which had been ordered. Mitchell originally believed he had participated in the mediation, but he “came to understand that was not ‘full mediation.’ ” The motion was denied.

involved in numerous cases involving the Hurst family, which resulted in undue influence.

These contentions may be quickly addressed. The attachments Mitchell argues were not file stamped were in fact attached to Mitchell's response to the restraining order request, which was itself filed stamped and is part of the record on appeal. In short, nothing appears to be missing.

As to the denied continuance, Mitchell fails to show how denying his last-minute request for a continuance, in order to participate in mediation, was an abuse of discretion. (*Independent Roofing Contractors v. California Apprenticeship Council* (2003) 114 Cal.App.4th 1330, 1336 [it is the appellant's duty to demonstrate error in the reasoning of the trial court's ruling].)

Mitchell challenges the admission of certain text messages as inadmissible hearsay. But because the record is silent as to the text messages' content, we must assume they were either not inadmissible hearsay or offered for a nonhearsay purpose. (See *Schall v. Lockheed Missiles & Space Co.* (1995) 37 Cal.App.4th 1485, 1488 [we presume the correctness of the trial court's evidentiary rulings unless the appellant affirmatively shows error].)

The last two contentions amount to bare assertions of an excessive order and judicial bias. Mitchell has failed to explain how the three-year order was excessive or how the trial court showed judicial bias. Having no obligation to address perfunctory and undeveloped claims, we decline to do so here. (See *People v. Barnett* (1998) 17 Cal.4th 1044, 1182 [the failure to support claim with adequate argument forfeits the claim as not properly raised]; *Jones v. Superior Court* (1994) 26 Cal.App.4th 92, 99 ["Issues do not have a life of their own: if they are not raised or supported by argument or citation to authority, we consider the issues waived"].)

In sum, Mitchell's contentions are forfeited, but were they preserved, they would have no merit.

DISPOSITION

The judgment (order) is affirmed. Hurst is awarded costs on appeal. (Cal. Rules of Court, rule 8.278(a)(1) & (2).)

RAYE, P. J.

We concur:

ROBIE, J.

KRAUSE, J.